DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 640 EA 007 083

AUTHOR Taylor, Burtis E.
TITLE Setting Administrator Salaries.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National School Boards Association (35th, Miami Beach, Florida, April 19-22, 1975); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Background; Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Responsibility; Educational Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Merit Pay; Research; *Salaries; Salary Differentials; *Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

To determine administrator salaries, the Glendale Unified School District contracted with a management consultant firm to conduct a study. The results led to recommendations that included two traditional criteria: academic attainment and longevity of service. Nine factors were identified that are common to all administrative positions, but with varying degrees: total years in current position, total certified experience, highest degree earned, credit beyond the bachelor's degree, number of months worked per year, extra hours per week required by the position, level of management responsibility, consequence of error, and effectiveness. Each factor has a total potential point value, and a computer program determines the point value in terms of dollars. Tables illustrate salaries computed on point factors, average factor ratings by position, and examples of salary distribution by point factors. The study concludes with administrative salary schedule regulations. (Author/DW)

ED105640

1975 NSBA CONVENTION/MIAMI BEACH, APRIL 19-22, 1975
SPEAKER Taylor, Burtis E. CLINIC NO. B-17 PROGRAM p. 24

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SETTING ADMINISTRATOR SALARIES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Salary schedules or plans for reimbursement of staff members of the educational enterprise are essential in an adequate personnel program.

Any Board Member or administrator knows the many problems that arise immediately when proposals or ideas are presented to study salary schedules, whether it be schedules of the teaching or administrative staff.

For the past several years our Board of Education had been questioning the plan or schedule which was used to equate pay plans for our administrators. One could summarize their concern as follows:

1. Should the administrators salary schedules be based upon a "Ratio" applied to the teachers salary schedule?

2. Should it be reasonable to make comparisons between the District's administrative salary schedule and that of other similar organizational entities in the educational, governmental, industrial, and business sectors?

3. Should other factors rather than years of service and educational degrees as preparation be used in developing an administrative salary schedule?

4. Is it warranted to develop an alternative salary administrative program that may include a detached salary schedule, a performance evaluation system, and/or a merit increase procedure?

In light of these four basic questions I had many long discussions with our administrative staff. The outgrowth of the discussions led to an agreement to really study the problem in depth. It was recognized, however, that we needed staff assistance if the program were to get underway and succeed.

In August 1972, I recommended to the Board of Education that it authorize me to solicit proposals from companies to make a comprehensive study of the district's administrative salary schedule. During August letters were sent to approximately 20 management consultant firms soliciting proposals.

By mid-October, after screening the various proposals, the staff, Board of Education and I interviewed representatives of five firms (regarding their proposals). On November 21st, after almost four months of study and review of the proposals the staff recommended [illegible] be selected.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 007 089

Upon being selected the firm appointed a team of three persons to conduct the study. The district appointed two staff members to be the liaison between the district and the firm.

Representatives of the firm and district liaison personnel scheduled three administrative area staff orientation meetings, with approximately 30 administrators in attendance at each meeting to discuss the study.

Besides these meetings, the firm's team held a meeting with representatives of the Elementary and Secondary Administrators Association to discuss the study in more detail.

To evaluate position data an administrator's position questionnaire was designed to compile an inventory of each employee's duties, responsibilities, and other pertinent facts of each position under study. Further, a supplemental questionnaire was designed to elicit employee's attitude about his position and work environment. The attitude questionnaire was returned directly to the firm's office to ensure that the confidentiality of the employee's response was maintained.

As an added scope to the study, I requested that the design of the above referenced questionnaire be reviewed by a representative group of employees to ensure that the drafted forms were complete and easily understood. As a result, a committee of 11 representative employees was appointed.

To further validate the position questionnaire information, the firm's team conducted 37 job audit interviews at various locations in the district.

Of the 90 Confidential Employee Attitude questionnaires distributed 79 were actually returned (88 percent). Further, each employee had the option to request a confidential interview with one of the consultants regarding work-related matters. These employees were scheduled for interviews along with the regular job audit interviews. This scheduling procedure made it possible to protect the identity of the employees. To this date I have no idea how many employees requested such attitudinal interviews.

The data collected showed a great many concerns from a large classification group, the Elementary School Principals. A group meeting was held so they could present their concerns. Approximately 16 of a possible 21 principals attended the meeting.

Besides gathering necessary information from the employees of the District, it was agreed that a portion of the study should involve a review of school districts comparable to Glendale to develop quantitative information on administrative salaries and to determine what policies, trends, and attitudes relative to R-Factors and administrative salary schedules are developing in the school administration environment.

Initially, we had determined that Southern California was the primary market and competitive area for administrative personnel interested in Glendale. Therefore, our survey of salaries was limited to a list of what we considered comparable districts. The firm's representatives developed audit instruments which were used to gather comparable data by means of a personal interview with representatives of each district studied. However, we did gather considerable data from school districts of the United States, such as policy procedures and structural organization of administrative salary schedules. These data helped in a number of problem solutions as our study progressed.

In the proposal the question had been raised, should it be reasonable to make comparison between district administrative salary schedules and that of other similar organizational entities in the educational, governmental, industrial, and business sectors?

Considerable attention was directed toward the inclusion of industrial administrative positions in survey, but all attempts to do so proved inconclusive. We could have made comparisons on the basis of generic titles alone, but any deeper examination of actual job functions proved this to be misleading.

The principal reason for this is that there is no credential requirement for industrial jobs that approximates that of the educational field. This precludes comparisons between educational and industrial administrative positions since they do not exist in the same labor market. In California under existing laws (except Superintendent) because of certification requirements there is no way that an administrator in an industrial or commercial business can transfer his experience and training directly into the education field.

In addition, the basic objectives of both occupational fields are dissimilar. The profit motive, with its attendant system of goals and rewards, cannot logically be compared to the social objectives and motivations of the educational field which are significantly dissimilar.

And finally, actual job functions comparisons between administrative positions in industry and education show very little similarity. There may be comparison with some jobs at the District Office, such as Budget Analyst, Purchasing Agent, or Personnel Director, but the large preponderance of administrative positions in education (Principals and Vice-Principals) have almost no comparable basis with industrial supervisory and middle-management positions with regard to such basic management elements as products, inventory and financing. In effect, a school principal is not a plant manager.

In analyzing the question, should the administrative salary schedule be based upon a "Ratio" applied to the teachers salary schedule, we found in California that 57% of all school districts in the state used the R-Factor system and of the 25 districts in the more than 25,000 A.D.A. size, with which Glendale Unified measures itself, 46 percent use this method for determining administrative salaries.

Our studies did not necessarily reflect significant changing trends in either direction, but did find many school districts were examining their particular R-Factor plan in light of present and changing effects of collective bargaining legislation. Further, we found there is hesitation to adopt compensation plans which are new to school environment. Where changes are being made in R-Factors, administrators do not appear to have strong feelings for or against its usage, except for the favorable salary treatment they think it provides by eliminating the need to negotiate separately for salary increases.

When we analyzed the responses from our administrators regarding their feelings about removal from the R-Factor, we found some significant indications. Although 75 percent were opposed to discontinuing the R-Factor (31 percent strongly disagreed), the following responses did not support this attitude:

- 39 percent agreed that the size of the school should influence their pay;
- 38 percent agreed that student population characteristics should influence their pay;
- 22 percent agreed that school location should influence their pay;
- [illegible] agreed that the existance of special programs should influence their rate of pay;
- 41 percent thought that pay based solely on longevity reduced incentive to better performance.

Our results showed that a significant number of administrators agree that factors other than academic credits and longevity are logical considerations in establishing pay rates. It would appear that more administrators would be willing to relinquish the R-Factor concept if they were made aware of rational alternatives that would compensate them equitably.

As stated earlier the Board of Education had expressed its interest in the possibility of introducing a merit pay and performance evaluation concept into the Administrator's Salary Schedule.

The present dialogue revolving around merit pay in the education field has incorporated such modern concepts as "accountability for Education," "performance contracting," "criterion measurement," and "objective setting." In spite of the revised interest, only a relatively few school districts throughout the country report continued success with merit pay plans. (Many have attempted such plans, but the majority have been discontinued for a variety of reasons.) On the other hand, a

large number (possibly even a majority) of school districts report the existence of some form of evaluation plan that is not tied to merit pay.

The concept of performance evaluation was not new to Glendale administrative personnel, for in 1969 performance evaluations for Central Office staff and building principals were established. In 1972, the state of California created a legal framework to provide mandatory performance evaluation of all certificated employees. Therefore, the concept of performance evaluations in our district was not new, but the concept of possibly relating merit pay to performance was.

From this point to the end, I will be using overhead projector slides and will not be using this material verbatim. I thought it would be valuable for you as participants to get the overall feeling of the presentation that will be made. I hope that it does not cause too great a concern on your part, but I am sure this will be clarified in the short use of overhead slides. In addition, the slides that will be presented are attached.

With this background information, the question was, what should be recommended? The recommendation was as follows: The R-Factor salary schedule was to be eliminated. All management administrative positions were to be broken down into nine factors -- which were common to all jobs but which exists in each job in varying degrees. The plan would continue to retain the two historical criteria: academic attainment and longevity in the education field. Approximately one-half of total value is assigned to the traditional factors and one-half to the new factors. The factors are used as follows:

Factor 1 - Total years in current position. This factor allocates 15 percent of total compensation for experience in the current position, up to a maximum of four years.

Factor 2 - Total certificated experience. Of total compensation, 14.7 percent is allocated for all certificated experience up to seven years.

Factor 3 - Highest degree earned. Each academic degree level achieved receives additional compensation until the maximum of 13.2 percent of total compensation is attained.

Factor 4 - Credit beyond the bachelor's degree. Compensation units are awarded according to the existing district credit groupings, i.e., 14, 28, 42, 56, and 70 units. An additional unit is paid as each group is completed and maximum values comprise 6.0 percent of total possible compensation units.

Factor 5 - Number of months worked per year. This factor will have no compensation value. The factor is included for statistical analysis purposes only.

Factor 6 - Extra hours per week required by the position. All positions were evaluated by the consulting team, in conjunction with District representatives, as having varying requirements for extra hours of work. It is recognized that all administrative and management positions entail some level of working hours beyond the normal work day; this is traditionally accepted as a necessary element of the job. Positions which required this amount of extra work--rated as insignificant--received no extra compensation value. Other positions were evaluated as requiring either a significant or highly significant amount of extra hours to properly fulfill their responsibilities, and compensation values were assigned accordingly. Only the extra time requirements of the position are considered and not the personal working habits of the incumbent.

Factor 7 - Level of management responsibility. Each position in the administrative group was rated on a factor of one to five according to the scope and level of responsibility it entailed within the District. The factor represents 15 percent of total compensation value. Management responsibility can be for operations, programs, people, or any combination thereof. Levels for Factor 7 range from one to five. Those positions having the greatest responsibility for operations, programs, and personnel in Glendale Unified School District, i.e., the Deputy Superintendents, were placed at Level 5. (The Superintendent's position is not covered by this plan.) All other positions are ranked below Level 5 according to the relative degree of management responsibility they entail.

The responsibility levels were rated by the consulting team, with input from District representatives, on an X-Y rating scale. That is, each position was first analyzed to determine if its scope was District-wide, sub-Districtwide, schoolwide, or sub-schoolwide. Then the position was rated for responsibility level of size and complexity of operations, number of people, and size and complexity of programs, and ranked with all other positions in the plan. Finally, the scope evaluation and the level evaluation were combined to allocate the position's proper relationship in the organization.

Factor 8 - Consequence of errors (15 percent of total). One of the primary elements of a managerial position is the requirement to make decisions that will effect other people, quantities of resources, community relationships, the success or failure of programs and operations, etc. Each position in the program was rated on a scale of 1 to 5 by considering the possible effect of erroneous decisions made by an incumbent. Such things were evaluated as the impact on the success or failure of the District as an educational delivery system, numbers of people inside and outside the District who could be affected by wrong decisions, amount of resources (dollars, facilities, time, people, etc.) that could be lost, etc.

It should be observed that while there is a tenuous relationship between Factors 7 and 8, no direct correlation exists. Consequently, it is found that positions will frequently be ranked higher in one factor and lower in another. It is exactly this variability that makes both of these job elements valid measures of the managerial function.

Factor 9 - Effectiveness. Of total compensation value, 6 percent has been allocated to the degree of effectiveness with which an incumbent performs in the position. It will be distributed on the basis of a normal curve--a standard compensation value will be paid to everyone who achieves at least average performance; a double value will be paid for outstanding performance (limited to 16 percent of the population), and those whose performance is below average (again limited to 16 percent of population) will receive no compensation unit for this factor.

Dollar Conversion of points per factor

Each factor has a total potential value achievable by the incumbent having the highest factor level; example: the highest achievable level in Factor 4 (Credits beyond Bachelor's degree) is 5 by completing 70 units of academic credit. The computer program then determines how much each point value is worth in dollars and multiplies this by the number of total potential points for each factor.

SALARIES COMPUTED ON POINT FACTORS

(@ $2.8013 per point)

Factor and Title	Points Per Level	Maximum Levels	Total Potential Points	Dollars Per Level	Total Potential Dollars
1. Years' experience in current job (4 max.)	37.75	4	151.0	$105.75	$ 423.00
2. Total certificated experience (7 max.)	21.00	7	147.0	58.83	411.79
3. Highest degree earned (BA-1, MA-2, Ph.D.-3)	44.00	3	132.0	123.26	369.77
4. Credit earned beyond BA (14-1, 28-2, 42-3, 56-4, 70-5)	12.00	5	60.0	33.62	168.08
5. Months worked per year (10-1, 11-2, 12-3, no assigned value	-	3	-	-	-
6. Extra hours required (insignificant-0 significant-1, highly significant-2)	60.00	2	120.0	168.08	336.16
7. Level of management responsibility (lowest-1, highest-5)	30.00	5	150.0	84.04	420.19
8. Consequence of errors (lowest-1, highest-5)	30.00	5	150.0	84.04	420.19
9. Effectiveness of job performance (ineffective-0, average-1, outstanding-2)	45.00	2	90.0	126.06	252.12
Total			00.0		$2,801.30

AVERAGE FACTOR RATINGS BY POSITION

	F 6 0-1-2	F 7 1-2-3-4-5	F 8 1-2-3-4-5	TOTAL
SUPERVISOR of OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION	0	1	2	3
COORDINATOR of SECONDARY INSTRUCTION	1	2	2	5
COORDINATOR of SPECIAL EDUCATION	0	3	3	6
COORDINATOR of ESEA-TITLE I	1	1	2	4
COORDINATOR of GIFTED PROGRAM	0	2	1	3
DISTRICT COUNSELOR	0	1	1	2
HEAD NURSE	0	1	2	3
PERSONNEL ASSISTANT	0	1	2	3
MUSIC TEACHER CONSULTANT	0	1	1	2

AVERAGE FACTOR RATINGS BY POSITION

	F 6 0-1-2	F 7 1-2-3-4-5	F 8 1-2-3-4-5	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL - ELEMENTARY	1	3	3	7
PRINCIPAL - JUNIOR HIGH	1	3	4	8
PRINCIPAL - SENIOR HIGH	2	4	4	10
VICE PRINCIPAL - JUNIOR HIGH	1	2	2	5
VICE PRINCIPAL - SENIOR HIGH	2	2	2	6
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT - ADMINISTRATION	2	5	5	12
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT - INSTRUCTION	2	5	5	12
DIRECTOR of EDUCATION PLANNING/ ASSISTANT to SUPT.	2	3	4	9
DIRECTOR of PERSONNEL SERVICES	2	4	4	10
DIRECTOR of ELEMENTARY ED.	2	4	4	10
DIRECTOR of INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES	2	3	3	8
DIRECTOR of PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES	2	3	3	8
DIRECTOR of ARTS IMPACT/ ARTISTS IN SCHOOLS	1	1	2	4
DIRECTOR of CHILDREN'S CENTER	0	2	2	4

EXAMPLES OF SALARY DISTRIBUTION

BY POINT FACTORS

(@ $2.8013 per unit value)

Central Office Administrator

Factor	Per Level	Assigned Level	Total Units	Value Per Unit	Dollars Per Factor
1	37.75	2	75.5		$ 211.50
2	21.00	7	147.0		411.79
3	44.00	2	88.0		246.51
4	12.00	5	60.0		168.08
5	.00	3	.0	x$2.8013	.00
6	60.00	2	120.0		336.16
7	30.00	4	120.0		336.16
8	30.00	4	120.0		336.16
9	45.00	1	45.0		126.06
			Total Monthly Salary:		$2,172.42

EXAMPLES OF SALARY DISTRIBUTION

BY POINT FACTORS

(@ $2.8013 per unit value).

Field Administrator

Factor	Units Per Level	Assigned Level	Total Units	Value Per Unit	Dollars Per Factor
1	37.75	4	151		$ 423.00
2	21.00	7	147		411.79
3	44.00	2	88		246.51
4	12.00	5	60	x$2.8013	168.08
5	.00	1	0		.00
6	60.00	1	60		168.08
7	30.00	3	90		252.12
8	30.00	3	90		252.12
9	45.00	2	90		252.12
			Total Monthly Salary:		$2,173.82

11

13

GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY SCHEDULE REGULATIONS
1974-75

1. Schedule assumes all administrators will have had seven years of certificated experience. If less than seven years of certificated experience, deduct $70.00 per month for each year less than seven.

2. Schedule assumes all administrators will have a Master's Degree.

   a. Without a Master's Degree deduct $65 per month.

   b. With Doctorate, add $65 per month.

3. Schedule assumes all administrators will have earned 70 or more units beyond the Bachelor's Degree.

   a. If earned units are less that 70, but are 56 or more, deduct $70 per month.

   b. If earned units are less than 56, but are 42 or more, deduct $140 per month.

   c. If earned units are less than 42, deduct $210 per month.

4. Effectiveness Factor

   a. The procedure for implementing an effectiveness factor will be developed in 1974-75.

   b. Evaluations, using newly developed forms, will be implemented in 1975-76, or sooner if possible.

GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY SCHEDULE
1974-75

POSITION	YEARS IN POSITION				
	1	2	3	4	5
Advisor	1804	1853	1902	1951	2000
Coordinator, Arts Coordinator, Early Childhood Ed. Coordinator, Gifted Program Coordinator, Intercultural Ed. Coordinator, Music Coordinator, Occupational Ed. Coordinator, Physical Education Head Nurse	1892	1941	1990	2039	2088
Coordinator, Secondary Guid. & Att. Personnel Assistant	1948	1997	2046	2095	2144
Coordinator, Secondary Instruction Director, Children's Center Vice Principal, Junior High	2017	2066	2115	2164	2213
Director, Instructional Support Serv. Director, Pupil Personnel Serv. Director, Special Education Director, Career Education Coordinator, Title I Principal, Continuation High Vice Principal, Senior High	2088	2137	2186	2235	2284
Principal, Junior High	2158	2207	2256	2305	2354
Director, Elementary Educa. Director, Personnel Services Assistant to the Superintendent Principal, Senior High	2221	2270	2319	2368	2417
Deputy Superintendent - Admin. - Instruction	2581	2630	2679	2728	2777